

March 5, 1992

LB 922, 1063, 1120, 1120A
LR 219

not, so ordered. Mr. Clerk, next bill, please. Mr. Clerk, would you like to read into the record?

CLERK: Mr. President, thank you. I do have just a couple of items. Senator Moore has amendments to be printed to LB 1063; and Senator Withem, amendments to LB 922. (See pages 1168-70 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, LR 219 was a resolution introduced by Senators Warner, Landis, and Withem at the request of the Governor. (Read brief explanation.) The resolution was introduced on January 13 of this year, at that time referred to the Revenue Committee. The resolution was advanced to General File. I do have Revenue Committee amendments pending, Mr. President. (See AM2861 on page 815 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR CONWAY: Senator Haberman, you rise for what purpose?

SENATOR HABERMAN: A point of privilege. Mr. President, I believe the next bill is LB 1120A. That was not in the motion, Senator Hall. I am very sorry, but your motion was to bracket LB 1120. Nothing was said about LB 1120A.

SENATOR CONWAY: Senator Haberman, under our rules, we can't consider an A bill ahead of the mainline bill, so, therefore, that is the reason we passed over it. I will now recognize Senator Warner for the opening on...excuse me, Senator Hall has committee amendments first on LR 219CA.

SENATOR HALL: I don't care. If you want to go to Senator Warner to open, that is fine. We can deal with committee amendments. All the committee amendments do, Mr. President, is there was a portion of the bill that dealt with, or the CA that dealt with the referring to the federal law with regard to the property tax system and changes the retroactivization of the authority for the legislative provisions in it. It says here that under the committee amendment the retroactive clause would be taken out and put into a new Section 13, so that it would be separated. It came at the tail end of the section in the originally introduced LR 219CA. What we did is separate it out so it was a specific provision all unto itself, and there was a provision that said...dealing with the federal legislation, the specifically 4-R kinds of provisions, if you will, those types of individuals. If there was an exemption, for example, granted to railroads, that those would be the only people that would